DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

* * *

BUILDING CODES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

* * *

MEETING

* * *

WEDNESDAY,

FEBRUARY 18, 2004

* * *

The Advisory Committee meeting was held in Room 220 South, 441 Fourth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Jerrily Kress, Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

JERRILY KRESS, Chairperson

DAVID BARDIN

SARA BARDIN

FRANK BECKER

BYROU BLACK

WESTER CLEMONS

DAVE CONOVOR

NEAL R. GROSS

PRESENT: (cont.)

HOWARD EBENSTEIN

ELLIOT EISENBERG

MARC FETTERMAN

MILES HABER

MICHAEL HERDEMAN

JIM LOWERY

SAMANTHA McASKILL

GAIL MONTPLAISIR

DENZEL NOBLE

SHAUN PARR

JIM SHABELSKI

JOAN STOGIS

JOHN STOVALL

JOHN WALL

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(10:15 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I'd like to call to order the Building Code Advisory Committee meeting of February 18th, 2004.

Today we're going to be doing a few things that weren't initially planned, but we do want to finish on or before noon as tomorrow there is a seminar at the National Press Building sponsored by D.C. BIA, the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, AOBA, and the Washington Building Congress regarding the new building codes that have come into effect January 9th.

And so the speakers who are basically all of the chairs of all of the subcommittees we need to have a run-through. So we're going to try to do an abbreviated meeting today if that's all right with everyone.

By the way, it is free, and right now they're estimating some 400 people will be in attendance. So it grew a little larger than those of us who originally volunteered knew we were getting

think it's well worth into, but Ι 1 to get the 2 information out there as quickly as possible about the 3 new codes because we are talking a whole new family of codes as well. 4 I do have one problem that I will bring up 5 6 while everyone is here. Ιt appears that Mr. 7 Papadopolous has been in a very -- how do I say it? -bad car accident. I was trying to think of another 8 9 word instead of "bad," but he has been in the hospital for some time, and so he will not be able to cover the 10 11 So I didn't know if we could find meeting tomorrow. 12 someone else that could speak to mechanical --13 I was just going to as is Mr. MR. WALL: Papadopolous in the United States in case anybody 14 wants to write? 15 16 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yes, sir. You might 17 say since you're the one who knows. You talked to his 18 assistant, did you not? Basically he was in a 19 MS. BARDIN: Yes. car accident last week, and he was in intensive care 20 21 on machines, but apparently he's doing a lot better.

They've taken him off the machines, and he will be

1	leaving ICU some time this week, but he will be in the
2	hospital, and he'll be in rehabilitation for some
3	time.
4	PARTICIPANT: Which hospital will that be?
5	MS. BARDIN: That I don't know. I can
6	find that out for you though.
7	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: His office probably
8	would know. It's PKP Engineers.
9	MS. BARDIN: And Milton is the name of his
10	assistant.
11	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And Milton is the name
12	of his assistant.
13	Does anyone have any suggestions who we
14	might get to speak? I mean, James, you're going to be
15	speaking to the plumbing. Can you speak to the
16	mechanical, too? Do you have any suggestions who we
17	might be able to get to speak to a mechanical
18	overview?
19	Armando is not here.
20	MR. NOBLE: I spoke to him last night.
21	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Okay, and by the way,
22	for those of you who don't remember from years ago

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	when we did this, we were at the table and people in
2	the room spoke, and unfortunately to be heard you have
3	to come up and use one of our mics or speak very, very
4	loudly, and I'll rely on our court reporter to let us
5	know.
6	But perhaps I don't know if anyone has any
7	suggestions who might speak to mechanical. I know
8	that Armando knows quite a bit about the mechanical.
9	MR. NOBLE: I could speak to Belour
10	Ravishankar (phonetic) because I know he served on the
11	subcommittee as the chief of the mechanical plan.
12	I'll have to do it when I get back this afternoon.
13	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Did Frank Becker also
14	serve on the committee?
15	MR. NOBLE: No. No, he was not there.
16	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Bill Zollars? Okay.
17	She's not hearing anything from the audience. So
18	we're going to have to by and large when you speak
19	have you come up here. I don't think this is really
20	important. We've missed this, and I've repeated it.
21	So if you can get Ravishankar, that might
22	be better because didn't he put the information

1	together for some of your handouts on the differences
2	and whatnot that DCRA prepared?
3	PARTICIPANT: It's just these four little
4	things plus boiler.
5	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Well, no, but it's the
6	difference between BOCA and the ICC, as well I mean
7	the IBC and the whole that I think we need to address.
8	Does anybody know how to get in touch? Is
9	Ravishankar do you think available?
10	MR. NOBLE: Yes. All of the chiefs will
11	be at a meeting tomorrow.
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Oh, well, then maybe
13	that would be if he's going to be there anyway,
14	that might be an idea.
15	We'll try that, and if not, we'll try to
16	get Bill Zollars. I hate to do this at a last minute,
17	but obviously things that are accidents are out of our
18	control.
19	Thank you.
20	With that, Dave Connor with the ICC is
21	here today, and he is going to make a short
22	presentation.

MR. CONNOR: Very brief. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Make sure the mic is Did you get the hand-held mic? Is it working? 3 Can you hear me? MR. CONNOR: 4 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: 5 Yes. 6 MR. CONNOR: I brought some information on 7 Phil, I'm going to turn around. the ICC. CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Why don't you take the 8 9 chair on the other side instead of having to sit with your back? We did have a walk-around mic now so that 10 11 people who want to speak we can pass that around. I didn't prepare a formal 12 MR. CONNOR: 13 PowerPoint because I realize the time was limited, and I just want to really make a couple of remarks and 14 15 then answer any questions you have. 16 Basically our headquarters office at the 17 International Code Council is right across the river 18 in Virginia, and so we're here to help, but I guess we need to hear from you as to what kind of help or 19 assistance you need with respect to implementation. 20 21 We don't want to presume to come in and tell D.C. or

the Commonwealth of Virginia or the State of Maryland

how to adopt and implement codes, but we facilitate the process of development of the codes and have a number of programs and support materials available.

So we're kind of here to help, but again, we kind of need to hear from you.

Very briefly, the ICC was formed in 1994 through the consolidation of BOCA, ICBO and SBCCI. That effectively book place February 1st of last year. There is no more BOCA, Southern or ICBO. It's one organization, 340 staff, 15 location in the U.S., two internationally, et cetera, et cetera.

One of the things that I think would be of interest to you and I put in this handout, we're in the process of a code development cycle right now that will result later on this year in the publication of a supplement to the 2003 editions of the codes. You, I believe, have adopted the 2000 editions.

And in amendments the your to international codes, you have an number of things that you think are of relevance to D.C., and in addition, you may have a number of recommended changes to the codes through your amendments that are really

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

applicable nationally.

So one of the things certainly you might want to consider is submitting some changes to the code chain cycle, and what I've done in a one-pager that's in the handouts that I've brought you is actually the cycle that will be coming up resulting in the 2006 edition of the codes.

My assumption is you're going to start looking at the 2003 editions and eventually make some amendments to those and go from 2000 to 2003, but by August 20th of this year, if you have anything that you think ought to be changed in the international codes, submit it. The idea would be with success the 2006 edition that's ultimately printed looks a little bit more favorable to your interest and concerns here in D.C., and I'm pretty familiar with them having lived here 50 out of my 53 years and going to high school and college in D.C.

Anyway, August 20th of this year you can submit changes either as a group, as individuals, or however you want to handle it. Maybe your code advisory committee could put some things together, but

the point is you would submit them and maybe in 2006 the codes are a little bit more palatable to your liking.

And, again, there are a number of steps in this process. I won't belabor them. It's just that I've done the sheet for you, and it's here.

Other than that, really as I've said earlier, we kind of here to help DCRA, the building industry, the citizens of the city in implementing and using the codes. I wish I could help with your plight on mechanical.

Ι have degrees in mechanical two actually was engineering, and member the а International Mechanical Code Committee when it was first set up before I joined ICC and was with Battelle, and I kind of know the document like the back of my hand. I certainly could get up to speed on your amendments quickly, and I know the differences between the old BOCA code.

Unfortunately, I'm busy tomorrow, and the point is that this seminar that you're putting on, if I had known, we could have offered some assistance and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

just basically said anything you'd like. If you need copies of the code or if you need copies of crosswalks that show somebody the difference between BOCA and 2000 I-codes, we could do that.

So, again, I'm kind of here desperately saying we're right across the river. There's 360 people in our company that can help, but we don't want to presume to tell you what to do. We want to be here and available to, you know, provide that assistance.

And I know I've left some messages and some E-mails with Denzel, and hopefully you'll take this as a sincere, but I've got to hear from you folks. I don't want to be a pest, et cetera.

In terms of publication of the codes, we can work with you to help publication of the codes with the amendments. In fact, the entire set of documents that we have, handbooks, commentaries, what we call plastic checklists for inspectors. There's a nice plastic checklist, flip it over for mechanical, plumbing, building. We can actually work with you and through DCRA or however you want to do it, make those available.

And actually everything we have you can, in fact, get that in bulk and be a reseller. You can actually, if you will, be the conduit through which everybody in the building industry in D.C. comes to get the codes and handbooks and other things.

Educational assistance, any number of things we're happy to provide, and I can make things happen. I just need to know from you because, again, I don't want to be a pest and be constantly leaving phone messages and sending E-mails. I at some point just have to say, well, they'll call when they're ready.

I mentioned the field inspection guides. It's just an example, I think, real helpful. You don't need a full copy of the code. It's nice to have out in the pickup truck or whatever, but it's nice to have one document, other things that can fit into your pocket that help the inspector.

I mentioned cross-walks. Many people have questions about, well, what's the difference between BOCA and ICC codes on particular issues. We've got those published and available. So that's kind of

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

basically it in a summary. 1 2 I again, am sensitive to your time. 3 know you have a lot of other things to do. I'11 answer any questions you have. 4 The cross-walks, how 5 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: 6 are they organized? Is it like a reference manual 7 or --They're brief generally, and 8 MR. CONNOR: 9 they would explain to someone the significant 10 differences between, say, the 199 BOCA 11 building code and the 2000 international building code. 12 13 So in theory D.C. could take one of those and where you've made amendments, you 14 documents, 15 could, in fact, enhance that. So somebody could 16 understand kind of how to go from your previous 17 adopted version of BOCA to your currently adopted 18 version of the I codes with your amendments. So I'm a facilitator. I may be able to do 19 some of these things if I'm aware of the opportunity 20 21 like the thing tomorrow, except I'm committed tomorrow

for something else.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: All day? We could sneak you in early or late.

MR. CONNOR: It's pretty much all day. I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: We start at seven in the morning.

MR. CONNOR: Well, actually I get to work at quarter to seven. No, tomorrow, I'm sorry. I can't.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: No.

MR. CONNOR: But if I can't do it, use our office as a conduit, I will get to whatever offices in our ICC that can provide that assistance, whether it's tech services or education. As an example, we're working very closely with federal agencies right now because they're in the process of adopting the codes, and one of the things we're looking at is putting on every six months an educational seminar two or three days on the I codes right here in D.C. predominantly for federal agencies, but obviously the building industry and your offices here in D.C. and Northern Virginia and Maryland could benefit from that as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

So when we do this later this year, we certainly would want to keep you apprised of it, not that we're going to teach the D.C. code. What we're going to teach are the I codes, but certainly that would be something of interest, but all of these federal agencies, you know, are in the process of moving from BOCA or whatever they've had to the I codes, and we want to make sure that we're meeting their needs with respect to education.

So I'll answer any questions that you have and again want to try and be sensitive to your time.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Do you sell all of these? Can all of these be purchased in your Virginia office?

MR. CONNOR: No. We have an order form and you would fill that out and they get shipped from different locations, but the point I made earlier is if D.C. wants to be a reseller of all this, if you look and say, "This is what we'd like to do and we'd like to have in stock," we basically shift you whatever you need of that at a significantly reduced rate, and then you turn around and figure out.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So in reality if individuals were to get these documents, handbooks, et cetera, from ICC, it would cost them X. D.C. would get them at probably .4 times, and then D.C. can turn around and sell them at .6 times X, and so the person getting the documents is still getting them a lot less expensively, and D.C. ends up, if you will, being the --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: How big an order do you need?

MR. NOBLE: Well, this is Denzel Noble from DCRA. We tried that when we adopted BOCA for the first like 1980, '84 code, but I think there is something in D.C. law whereby we cannot sell the books for profit. If we buy it at a certain cost, we have to sell it at the same price. That's the reason why over the last two cycles we did not buy any books from BOCA, because DCRA, we had to come out of our budget. We had to buy the books, and we can't sell the books. It has to be sold through the Office of Documents if it's a government book.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: But couldn't we get a special discount for the use of the Building Code

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Advisory Committee and for the use of government employees? I mean, couldn't there be some special --

MR. CONNOR: I'm sure we could arrange that, certainly. Like I said, I sent you a few E-mails and left you a few messages. We want to work with you. I need to know from you what your system will accept and how you can deal with it, and then my job is to make it happen either with Mark Johnson, who handles publications or Kathleen Mahalich, who handles training or whatever.

So if you came back and said, "Gees, we can't do this because," and I understand you can't make money on them per se and I realize if it were just passing it through, passing the discount through to everybody and then it becomes a major hassle for your office because you're having to deal with all of these orders, and yet, you know, you're not getting -- so, you know, we can -- I'll work with you. I just need to know what you --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: As we're getting started, we don't have the codes yet, and it's a little difficult to be reviewing the codes and

1	recommending changes.
2	MR. NOBLE: We will be putting through an
3	order this week maybe tomorrow.
4	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Well, I was going to
5	say
6	MR. NOBLE: Not tomorrow. Friday.
7	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: maybe we need to
8	coordinate that first because we can get it at a
9	reduced rate.
10	MR. NOBLE: Oh, yeah. We do get it at
11	reduced rates. The last time, for instance, when we
12	bought the last set last year, we got the minimum that
13	the
14	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Oh, all right. I
15	wasn't aware of that.
16	MR. NOBLE: Yeah, we do get at a reduced
17	rate, but if we can get it even cheaper than what we
18	have to pay
19	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: It's where the good
20	guys.
21	MR. NOBLE: then of course, we can go
22	through.

1	MR. CONNOR: Well, then what I need to do
2	is get some feedback from you via E-mail, and what I
3	need to do then is link you with Mark Johnson and try
4	and make this happen to facilitate what you need, and
5	it may hopefully be better than, you know
6	MR. NOBLE: Yeah, because all we have to
7	do is fax them the invoice or the PO number, and the
8	next day it was on the trucks.
9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Questions for Dave?
10	Joan Stogis.
11	MS. STOGIS: This is Joan. Is this
12	working now? Okay. Joan Stogis.
13	First, Dave, I'm delighted that you're
14	here, and what I'm hoping you're hearing is that you
15	can be our kind of prime contact, and if so, can you
16	give us a phone number, E-mail address?
17	MR. CONNOR: Sure.
18	MS. STOGIS: I k now two and a half years
19	ago when I was leaving messages on the ICC's phone
20	number I was left with the feeling does anybody really
21	work here because it took six months to get back. I
22	know that's when you all were in a transition.

I will always get back with MR. CONNOR: 1 2 somebody even if it's to say, "I'm swamped right now. 3 Can you wait a week?" MS. STOGIS: Right. 4 I'll always respond. 5 MR. CONNOR: Ι 6 prefer not phone because I get nervous with that. 7 Things pile up. I can be out of town. It's dconover, dconover@iccsafe.org. 8 preferable. 9 read E-mail all the time. I respond, and what I have then in that E-mail is, so that there's no confusion, 10 11 I have a specific message from somebody that says, "Here's what I need," or, "here's what I want you to 12 do." 13 It's crystal clear. Then I can either 14 15 handle it directly or I can pass that on to somebody 16 in our office and say, "Gees, can you look at this? 17 Please get directly with so-and-so. Copy me on it so 18 that I know that we've closed the loop." And if I don't get a loop closure in a 19 reasonable time, then it triggers -- thank God for 20 21 Outlook --

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yes.

1	MR. CONNOR: but it triggers a, you
2	know, I need to look and say, "Hey, what happened to
3	this? Did you get back to this person?" et cetera,
4	but we want to close the loop and make sure.
5	MS. STOGIS: Thank you very much, Dave.
6	MR. CONNOR: Sure.
7	MS. STOGIS: That's great to have you so
8	close by, and I look forward to working with you.
9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And I do have everyone
10	in our committee's E-mail collocated. So if I need to
11	get a message out to all of the building code members
12	because of some information you have, you can send it
13	to me and I'll make sure it gets distributed.
14	MR. CONNOR: Okay, fine.
15	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Like I say, thank
16	heaven for Outlook. I just dial BCAC recipients, and
17	it has got everybody.
18	Shaun.
19	MR. PARR: Dave, I'm Shaun Parr.
20	Is the international existing building
21	code ripened to a point that it's as far as your
22	materials, et cetera, and all of your

1	MR. CONNOR: I'll have to check on that.
2	I don't know off the top of my head. I will check and
3	then
4	MS. STOGIS: It is published.
5	MR. CONNOR: Oh, I know it's published,
6	but since the question was education or checklists and
7	commentaries and all of those things.
8	MS. TALBOT: The other aspects of your
9	technical support services
10	MR. CONNOR: Right.
11	MR. PARR: that you've developed for
12	the other editions.
13	MR. CONNOR: I will check on that. Can
14	you give me a card? And then I'll have your E-mail,
15	and I'll get a response to you.
16	MR. PARR: And I have a second question
17	regarding the
18	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Actually, if you could
19	send that because I think that is a question
20	MR. CONNOR: Send it to you?
21	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yeah, and send it to
22	Shaun as well, but send it to me, if you don't mind,

because I think that's a question that a lot of folks here would like to have a response to.

MR. CONNOR: Okay.

MR. PARR: And you mentioned the field inspection guides. If you could elaborate a little bit more about those, and then also I'm just curious because we obviously work with Denzel and his staff a lot after the fact on these things, and I know and I've seen in the past various published commentaries, I guess, kind of the record of the deliberative process that was going through with each edition that obviously are very enlightening.

Are the field inspection guides premised on those or --

MR. CONNOR: The field inspection guides are premised on what's in the code, and there is one that is on plastic sheets that's actually held together by a spiral that I think has about four or five plastic sheets that's for one and two family dwellings, that covers the international residential code, and basically they have the key items that the inspector needs to look for in terms of building,

mechanical, plumbing, fire, and then there are field guides, separate ones, for the mechanical code, which is, you know, obviously used for other than one and two family dwellings, plumbing, building, again, to cover the high points of what an inspector needs to look for in terms of compliance.

That's distinctly different than you mentioned commentaries and interpretations. distinctly different than those types of materials Interpretations are, we have available. know, simply people can get an interpretation by just calling a phone number and asking a particular question, and then we have handbooks which are much more detailed that go into all of the nitty-gritty that would be more applicable to designers, plan review, things of that nature.

MR. PARR: A well equipped code enforcement official, I mean, what ought they to have?

I mean, a set of everything that you described at a minimum?

MR. CONNOR: Did you say inspector or --

MR. PARR: Well, code enforcement

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

official.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CONNOR: Well, my sense would be from an inspection standpoint you really get the key issues to look for in that building from the file that was established in the office for permitting and plan review, et cetera. So the inspector knows what they're going out to look for.

And they can have a complete copy of the code, but think really some of these field inspection checklists are much more, you know, user friendly for the inspector because it's guiding them on what they really want to look for in the field, whereas in plan review and the administration in the office, I think it's more, "I need a copy of the code. I need some of the handbooks. I need some of these things that help me understand some of the nuances in there."

I'm thinking out loud, but, for instance, if you were to take, say, the one and two family dwelling code field inspector document or the plastic sheets, you might look at that and say, "Well, we've made a few amendments," or, "we made some amendments

1	to the mechanical code that really don't make this
2	relevant, but if you made the following changes, it
3	would really work for D.C.," I'm sure our technical
4	and publications people can work with you to basically
5	take the guts of that thing and put in D.C. amendments
6	and then work with you so that DCRA could actually
7	take it and make it D.C. inspector guide, and it has
8	got a few tweaks that you need to make to the base
9	document.
10	I'm sure those are things, you know, that
11	we can work with you on to make happen if they can
12	facilitate use of the codes and your application of
13	them.
14	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Are there any other
15	questions?
16	MR. PARR: We were wondering if Dave could
17	repeat his E-mail address. Not everyone got it.
18	MR. CONNOR: dconover, conover,
19	@iccsafe.org.
20	PARTICIPATE: Is that F?
21	MR. CONNOR: S-a-f-e, safe.org.
22	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: If you have a moment

1	and if no one has any other questions, you might like
2	to hear our next presentation, which is regarding the
3	sprinkler issue, which is a very hot issue, shall we
4	say, for this community.
5	MR. CONNOR: I plan on staying until noon.
6	So I'll be here.
7	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yes, that might be
8	helpful for us.
9	Does anyone else have any other comments
10	before we move to
11	MR. CONNOR: Thanks for your time.
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Thank you for coming.
13	(Applause.)
14	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Mr. Stovall, would you
15	like to?
16	Oh, yes, these are for us, Dave, I assume?
17	MR. CONNOR: Yes, they are.
18	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: There might not be
19	enough for everyone. So if you need other copies, you
20	can probably E-mail Dave and he'll send it to you.
21	MR. CONNOR: Send your address and I'll
22	have one of our staff get it out.

MR. STOVALL: Hi. John Stovall. 1 2 When I was here last --3 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And chair of? And chair of Codes and MR.. STOVALL: 4 Standards. 5 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: For the residential. 6 7 MR.. STOVALL: For the residential section of the building code, both IRC and IBC. 8 9 When I was last here in December, the 10 issue of sprinklers in single family homes was brought 11 up and discussed, and as part of that, I had agreed because of our experience in surrounding jurisdictions 12 13 to try and, I quess, put a face on the fire problem that we have in residences so that perhaps we could 14 understand it better and actually in our own minds 15 16 resolve what we believe is the proper action to take 17 in response to fires in single family homes residences. 18 fortunate after 19 Ι very was meeting to be at International Home Buildings Show, 20 21 and Elliot Eisenberg spoke at that as part of really

the codes and standards portion of that show, where we

were discussing all of the international I codes and effect on home building.

Elliot is with the National Association of Home Builders, and he's in the home policy area of that organization, and as such, he has gathered a great number of statistics which I think are very important, and I think he related them very well, and I asked him if he would be willing to come and meet with us here today to give that to us, and I think this is a discussion, I think, rather than a presentation.

I think Elliot has about 15 minutes of talking, and then I think basically it would be a good thing at that time to open up the floor for any questions and other ideas and input that he might have.

So I would introduce to you at this time Elliot Eisenberg.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: By the way, let's take this second. For those of you who have come in late, please sign the list which is residing on the desk next to our wonderful court reporter. So if you

haven't signed in, please sign in so that we can have 1 2 you. 3 Yes, we wanted you to hear this. Sorry I interrupted you. This is Elliot Eisenberg. 4 Thank you very much. 5 MR. EISENBERG: It's 6 a pleasure to be here. It's always nice to share 7 one's research with interested of an group individuals. 8 9 I have a copy of my slides right here. 10 Feel free to pass them out. I've got some business 11 cards placed on the table in front of me. If you have questions that are really burning as I make the 12 13 presentation, feel free to raise your hand and I'll recognize you. If you can wait until the end, that 14 would be nice. 15 16 Again, my name is Elliot Eisenberg. 17 a pleasure to be here. 18 I have been interested in this issue of fire sprinklers and residential fire deaths 19 generally for about three years. My house actually 20 21 almost burned down this past summer. In July my house

was four minutes away from being totally burned to

crisp, and had a neighbor not seen the fire and doused it with the neighbor's hose, my whole house would have gone up in flames.

I was inside the house, and I had no idea.

A sconce outside caught fire. A bird built a nest and slipped the light on, and one thing led to another. This is an issue that's pretty close and near and dear to my heart as a result.

But about three years ago, as I say, I got interested in this issue, and I got interested in a simple observations couple of and one silly assumption. Economists have to have assumptions. I noticed that residential fire deaths differ from Some states have high fire death place to place. Some have very low fire death rates. rates. Some counties have extraordinarily high fire death rates, and some counties have fire death rate that are virtually nonexistent or, in fact, are nonexistent many times.

I've also noticed that fire death rates have changed substantially over the last 25 years where I've done the bulk of my research from 1979

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

onwards, and over that period of time they've fallen by about 60, 65 percent.

Then I make the assumption this is probably not a random process. This is not just things just happening. There must be some systematic causes resulting in these differences from place to place, and these reductions over time.

So what I'm going to talk about and what this paper discusses is why there are differences and why there have been changes. The rates, why have they fallen so substantially over time, and why are there differences from place to place? And in particular, which variables are best at explaining these differences in changes over times?

As a result, this paper will look at this problem from two different perspectives. It will first look at it cross-sectionally and say, "Let's look at the differences across America in the year 2000. Why are there some places that are much higher than others?"

The last half of the presentation will look at a time series and show why the rates have

NEAL R. GROSS

fallen and what are the explanatory variables that look at that, and by looking at this problem from both perspectives cross-sectionally and time series, we'll really have a much better understanding of what's going on.

This is the third study of the NAHB, my study, the third study the NAHB has conducted on this issue, and I entered this study pretty ignorant initially but thought, well, fires must be related to ages of houses. That seems like a pretty obvious place to begin. Old houses must burn down more than new houses.

And there were two studies that I could look at that gave me confirmatory evidence about this, both done by the NAHB. There were problems with both of them, but they both came to remarkably similar conclusions. What I have put down on the screen as you can see in front of you are the fire death rates per million individuals for each study, and while the numbers vary from study to study, the second study in the bottom only looks at California. The first study, the '87 study, looks at national numbers. They both

clearly show that fire death rates decline dramatically with houses of newer vintage.

So as the houses get older, as you go down the list, the fire death rates per million go up quite substantially. The first one was a mail survey, and the people that received the mail surveys went down to the city hall to find out where the deaths were, got the addresses of the houses and figured out how all of the houses were from tax records.

the second case, the researcher actually went to the individual houses himself and looked at 80 percent of all fire deaths in the State of California between 1986 and 1991. I thought both of these survey's research efforts had some troubles. The one and most importantly, they weren't reproducible. If you wanted to go talk to researcher, he couldn't give you the results very easily, and you could not reproduce them yourself.

That was, I thought a real drawback. And the second drawback I thought was this is too simple a world that they're looking at. It's not just so simple. You can't just say, well, it's the age of the

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

house and that's the end of the story.

Georgetown has lots of very old houses, and they don't burn down. Well, of course, they cost two million bucks a piece, but they don't burn down because people take really good care of older houses in many cases.

So we have to use statistical techniques that are a little bit more complex than that. So I use regression analysis, ordinary loose squares. I tried a couple other Tobit and Probit (phonetic) and Heckin Two-stage, but the result didn't change very much.

Data sources. It was critical to me. I decided a priori to use data sets that were publicly available to everybody so that if someone didn't like my research, I could give them my data set and I could say, "Hey, go to town. You don't like what I did? You can try, and if you don't believe me, you can download the date yourself from the CDC Website or from the Census Website, and you can do your own research and I'll tell you what I did, and you can reproduce it."

NEAL R. GROSS

So the residential deaths, I had county residential fire death data came from the Center for Disease Control, National Center for Health Statistics. They have a file called the multiple cause of death file.

Demographic data came primarily from the 2000 census. There's all kinds of information there, single family, multi-family, occupied, nonoccupied, residential, single fam., urban, rural, population density. There's a wealth of interesting data there.

And lastly I got some smoking by county, percentage of smokers within counties from the BRFSS data or the behavioral --

(Laughter.)

MR. EISENBERG: That's what it's called, behavioral risk factor surveillance system data. They ask questions like how many carrots do you have a week and have you had a mammogram and all of those sorts of health related questions.

But for this particular research smoking was a helpful thing to get out of that data. The analysis was based on the county level. I couldn't

NEAL R. GROSS

get lower than the county level. Looking at state level, there are 50 states. Fire death rates don't vary that much from state to state. They vary quite a lot, but not as much as they do within counties.

And my dependent variables I've mentioned earlier was the fire death per million persons rate. That's an important number because New York City is always going to have a lot more deaths than Washington, D.C. because it's 20 times bigger.

So looking at the death rate per million removes the impact purely of population and looks at a neutral number that's not biased in any shape, way or form.

The CDC suppresses data for small counties. They define small counties as counties below 100,000 people. So I had only 450 of the biggest counties in the country in my data, and of those, only 333 even had one fire death.

And I threw out one observation. It was Barrion County, Michigan, it turned out to be, because their fire death rate was twice as high as the next highest county, and I thought they must have had a

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

very bad year. They may have had one very bad fire. It isn't a very large county.

So I threw them out, and I had 457 counties in my regression equation. And the fire death rates among those counties varied from zero to 49, which is a lot of variation. So my model had a lot of explaining, an opportunity to try to explain a lot of variation. Let's put it that way.

The theory here is pretty simple. homes are probably better than older homes. better because there are better codes, as Mr. Conover -- I think Mr. Conover truly believes what he does helps houses and makes them better, safer places. That should result in newer homes being safer homes. They have better heating systems. They have better electrical systems. They have a myriad number of things that make them substantially better and quantitatively and qualitatively superior old to homes.

If nothing more, they're bigger, and if a house burns down and it's a one room house and you're in the house, you're in the room. But if you live in

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

a palace of Saddam Hussein's, half of the palace can burn down before you're aware that the palace is burning down. So bigger in and of itself makes a house safer. They're newer.

I thought that wealthier people or people with higher incomes probably treat their houses or dwellings better than people who are poor. It may not be that poor people don't want to treat them. They may just not have opportunity or ability to do so. They may live at the whim of the landlord. They may not have the money to spend to buy our fire extinguisher or whatever.

I thought wealth was probably an important variable, and then there are a host of control variables that are critically important to include in the equation.

The coefficients for those control variables are not something I really care about. I'm most interested in the first one, the age of the new home; to some extent, the wealth of the county as well. But if one of the omitted variables on the bottom, the control variables, is not included in the

equation, it might contaminate the results from the variables on top.

So I've got to include a whole lot of other stuff to make sure that my results are pretty clear and pretty straightforward and not biased because of something.

Rather than giving you the blow-by-blow detail of all the regression coefficients of all the stuff, I'm going to give you what I call the scenario analysis. It's a little more pleasant, a little more easy to understand. I can give you the coefficients at a later time. I've got a paper.

The result said that right now there are 8.45. This is for data for 2000. It has fallen slightly since then. There are 8.45 fire deaths per million, and in my data, I show 2,604 residential fire deaths in the year I did the research.

And then I say to myself, let's look at the results, the coefficients I got from my equations and let's make some assumptions. This is a cross-sectional data set that I've got. It has 457 counties or 453 for the U.S. in the year 2000. So what I'm

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

doing is I'm comparing counties. I'm looking at some counties that are built that are relatively new counties.

A county called Cullen County, Texas is the newest county in the country. In the last 20 years it has been building more houses and a higher percentage of its stock is brand new than any other county, even more than Clark County in Nevada, which was the eighth newest county in the country.

At the other end is a county called Scougle County, Pennsylvania. It's the oldest county in the country. San Francisco is an old county. New York City is an old county as well, by "old" meaning the age of the stock.

So let's compare these different counties, not those two literally, but let's compare the average county to a county that's ten percent newer, "newer" meaning newer housing stock, and housing stock new is defined by 1994. In '94, I tried '89 and '79 and '69, '59, '49, and the results were all quite similar. There didn't seem to be a great deal of difference.

I shouldn't say that. It kept improving

as I went forward. Newer houses were progressively safer, but I could have tried '89 or '79. The results were quite similar.

Sure enough, newer homes are safe homes. A county that's ten percent newer than the average county has a fire death per million rate that's 21 percent lower. If you translate that to the nation as a whole, you can't do that, of course, but in theory if you made every county ten percent newer in terms of its stock, you'd save 547 lives, down from 2,006, a tremendously gigantic number.

Similarly, if you made the counties wealthier, if you compare the county that was average wealth to one that was ten percent wealthier, it showed a 13 and a half percent decline in the fire death per million rate in that county, and if you put them both together, found a newer county and a wealthier county, the rate was 34 and a half percent lower.

variables alone So these two are explaining lot of this, and regression а my coefficients all had very high T statistics. The F

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

values were all quite high. The model was a reasonable model. So I'm not looking at variables that are not significantly different from zero. They had very high coefficients.

So clearly, of these two variables, the two most important ones that I found, numerous stock is particularly important, and that's a very pleasant and reassuring thing because with the rates of modern construction we're adding about one and a half percent to the total stock of housing every year. All of these houses are the beneficiaries of the I codes and they're safer and they're better and they're nicer.

And as a result, we can expect to see, I would not be surprised to see a continued decline in fire death per million rates of roughly three to three and a half percent per year because we're getting wealthier as a society and we're building more new homes every year.

So this story is a good story. Things are getting better.

Part two, cross-sectionally we know that the two most important variables are the age of the

NEAL R. GROSS

house and the wealth of the community. Now let's look at it in time series. Let's apply what we've learned and think up some other issues and go forward.

What happens over time? These are national numbers. The top number is total fire deaths. The yellow line, the pink line is residential fire deaths. They've fallen roughly 20 years ago from close to 5,000 to roughly two and a half thousand today, 40 or 45 percent decline in the total number of deaths.

Two and a half thousand deaths is still two and a half thousand deaths too many. Don't get me wrong, but this is remarkable improvement. It's really quite stupendous. This is a problem that is slowly going away.

All of the things that we've done to date so far and all of the interventions that we've done have had a dramatic effect, be it smoke detectors, be it new homes, be it we're getting wealthier as society, be it public service announcements, all of these things together are having the desired effect, and there doesn't appear to be a decline in the slope

of the line even recently because in the last two 1 2 years it doesn't seem to have moved much. 3 But generally speaking, it continues to by roughly 100 decline fire deaths 4 per year nationally. 5 Let's now look at Maryland. Maryland is 6 7 similar characteristics nearby. Ιt has some Washington, D.C., more similar 8 than at least 9 neighboring Virginia counties. There are two lines on this chart. The 10 11 top line is the fire, the total number of deaths. Unfortunately the axis can't be seen here. 12 I'm not 13 It goes from about 100 is the top sure what to do. number, the number of deaths in 1983 was about 95 in 14 15 the State of Maryland. It has now fallen to about 50. 16 It has? Okay, good. Thank you. 17 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yes, David Bardin just 18 pointed out the handout has it for those of you who didn't hear. So you can take a look at it there. 19 So the fire death, the 20 MR. EISENBERG: 21 number of fire deaths in the State of Maryland have fallen by 40 percent or so, 45 percent, nearly 50 22

percent, again, just like the nation, a tremendous downward improvement, this downward improvement continued improvement.

But the bottom line is the fire death per That's very interesting because it has million rate. fallen by about two-thirds. It went from about 22 in 183. It's now about nine. So it has fallen by more than the number of fire deaths, and that's reasonable.

The population of Maryland has grown quite a lot in the last 20 years. About a million more people live in Maryland now than did 20 years ago. you have a declining number of absolute deaths from about 90 to about 50 over a bigger population. numerator is shrinking. The denominator is getting bigger, and the whole fraction has got to be declining.

So the fire death rate is declining by more than the number of fire deaths, and that's as it should be for the nation as a whole. It also has to be that way because nationally we went from 5,000 to two and a half thousand, but over those 20 years our population grew by 50 or 60 million people.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In the normal state of affairs, that's a good thing. Let's look at Anne Arundel County, a typical nice, pleasant, fast growing county. Its population grew from roughly 350,000 to close to half a million people over this 20-year period.

Again, I have two different graphs. The pink one is the fire death per million rate, and it declined precipitously. The first couple of years the numbers bounce around a lot, but it's roughly about ten, is the average of those first four or five observations, and now it's more around two. That's a big decline, 80 percent.

The fire deaths, however, haven't declined so much. They fell from four to two. Again, the fire death rate declining faster than the number of fire deaths. A healthy growing, happy county; the chance of dying in a health, growing, happy county are low and they fall quite quickly.

You know, one person or two people per year are dying in Anne Arundel County. That's tremendous. I mean, you'd like to get it to zero, but objectively that's really quite hard. People do

things. Lightning hits houses. I mean, you can't stop every single natural disaster from occurring.

And in most counties where a trend was discernable, it looked like Anne Arundel County. There were a number of counties where there was no trend at all. There were so few fire deaths to begin with that you couldn't separate signal from noise. You couldn't tell, oh, you know, lightning hit a house or there was a bad one fire that killed four or five people and that spiked up the number of deaths from one or two to eight that year.

That's not a trend. That's just something just bad happened that year. There's many Maryland counties; there are very few fire deaths. Remember Maryland only has right now 50 fire deaths a year in the whole state.

But one place was special, and that's the City of Baltimore, and the City of Baltimore, rather than the rate being lower than the fire deaths, the fire deaths are falling at a faster rate than the rate. Again, remember nationally in the State of Maryland fire death rates are declining by more than

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

the number of absolute fire deaths.

In Baltimore this process is completely inverted. The fire deaths have declined, the bottom line here, from 45 or so to about 25, nearly half, but the rate has fallen from 60 to about 40, only about a third, and the reason is the population in Baltimore is declining, and it has declined precipitously. It has fallen by 20 percent over this period of time. This is really interesting.

Now, let's think back a couple of slides earlier to the total number of deaths in the State of Maryland. We knew it started out at roughly 90 or 95, and now it has fallen to roughly 50. Look at Baltimore. Baltimore still has half of the deaths in the entire state. It originally had about 50 out of 100 roughly and now it has 25 out of 50 in the entire state. Even though Baltimore's population is dropping like a rock essentially, it's still clinging to holding onto half of the fire deaths in the State of Maryland. That's really crummy.

What does this mean? Well, let's look at it. In the City of Baltimore, income is falling. Ten

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

years ago it was 80 percent of U.S. median family.

Now it's 70 percent. The housing stock is really old,

53 years. The population is shrinking. This is a

collection of really awful things.

mentioned earlier, despite As Ι the population, the precipitous population fall, Baltimore is still half of all of the fire deaths in the State of Maryland, which means that the chances of dying in in the City of Baltimore have increased relative to the rest of the Baltimore's fire death rates were 60 20 years ago per million; the state was 20. It was three times as Now it's four times as great.

They've come down everywhere. Absolutely Baltimore City is much safer than it was, but relative to the rest of the state, it has actually gotten worse, and so now it's four times as dangerous as the rest of the state.

You have a relatively worsening situation.

The fire deaths are becoming increasingly concentrated among a relatively small number of people who happen to live in the City of Baltimore.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And what does Baltimore have going for it negatively in this case? Old housing, poor people. That's a really toxic combination. It isn't that the declining population itself is so bad. That's just a signal that there must be some underlying factors that are really crummy.

Now I'm going to make a slight leap. What other local jurisdiction around here has suffered from declining population over the last 20 or 30 years? Any clues?

PARTICIPANT: The city.

MR. EISENBERG: Ha, ha, a cigar for you. But before I tantalize you with the D.C. information, I want to put this graph on. I'm going to tell you these are three different counties. They're all nearby. They're all roughly the same size. Fire deaths, fire death rates are on the left-hand side.

The top line has clearly got a real problem. Its fire death rate is two, three, or four times as high as the yellow and the pink line on the bottom. If you have a high fire death rate, you want to get it down, and you probably will have -- what do

1	we think we have in a place that has higher fire death
2	rates? Probably have old housing stock, probably have
3	low incomes because we know those two things generally
4	go together when it comes to fire death rates.
5	The yellow line seems to be trending down,
6	but I'm not 100 percent sure. There are so few fire
7	deaths in that county that it's hard to tell what's
8	going on. Is there really decline or is it just two
9	or three good years that were preceded by two or three
10	bad years? I don't know.
11	And the bottom line is so low that the
12	last year went up a lot. Three years, it may have
13	gone up, but maybe it didn't really. Maybe it's just
14	a bad year or two. I don't know.
15	By the way, one of these places has had
16	sprinklers for a long time. Anybody care to guess
17	which one it is? Which one is it?
18	MR. FETTERMAN: The top one.
19	MR. EISENBERG: The top one? Who thinks
20	it's the top one?
21	Any other guesses?
22	PARTICIPANT: Is this in Maryland?

1	MR. EISENBERG: P.G. County is in
2	Maryland. It's a bordering county east of here.
3	PARTICIPANT: Are all three of these
4	Maryland counties?
5	MR. EISENBERG: No. No one is prepared to
6	venture a guess. The top one, no, is actually D.C.
7	P.G. actually is the yellow one, which is interesting.
8	They installed sprinklers in when? '91 or '92?
9	Something like that.
10	'87 or '88? Which means that by '91 or
11	'92 maybe three or four percent of the stock in P.G.
12	had fire sprinklers. By now maybe 20 or 25 percent of
13	the stock in P.G., 20 percent, may have sprinklers.
14	But as you can see, the fire death rate is trending
15	down at the rate that the entire nation is declining.
16	Their sprinkler rate ought to be declining faster if
17	they've made this intervention. It should help. This
18	data doesn't show it. This rate shows that P.G. may
19	be declining, and if it is declining, it's declining
20	at the national rate.
21	One of these counties just passed
22	sprinkler legislation. Right, there's a pink line.

Their fire death rates are virtually nonexistent right now. They're virtually nonexistent. Two to three people, in general, a year are dying in Montgomery County. To install sprinklers when you've only got two people dying in a count of almost a million and their rate is already one-fifth the national average, there may be very good reasons; I not quite sure what they are.

But getting back to D.C., I think what's in D.C., D.C. has got a really serious problem relative to Montgomery and P.G. Their death rates are two or three times as high, and I think what's going on in D.C., D.C. is arguably a microcosm of Maryland. I think D.C. can be split in half, and you can think of D.C. as Northwest, for lack of a better word, where the houses are single fam. well maintained. The stock is in wonderful condition. They're being renovated and rehabilitated ongoing basis, and you have, shall we say non-Northwest where the houses are old; they're not in good condition; and I'm going to argue -- I don't have proof of this -- but I'm going to argue that the fire

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deaths in the District of Columbia are probably being increasingly concentrated in non-Northwest because that part of the city is like Baltimore City is to Maryland.

You've got a concentration of poor people in old housing, and if you have a fire death rate that is this high, the top blue line, the way to solve it, at least in my opinion, is to intervene in those houses because that's where the problem is. That's where the people are dying.

You've got ten, 12, 15 people a year, 20 people a year dying in D.C. in fires, and they're dying in existing housing. All the other data everywhere else is telling us that new houses aren't burning down much.

Let's recap. Fire death rates are likely to fall over time of a secular people because they're building more nice, new houses that are on good codes, and we're getting wealthier every year as a society. GDP per capita keeps going up. Those are all putting downward pressure on the fire death rates. So they will continue to fall.

But in the worst places, in the places that have high concentrations of poverty and the high concentrations of old stock, you've got a really bad problem, and the chance of dying in a fire in those places is likely to go up relative to other places. And if the population is actually declining, that's a clarion call that something very dramatically is going wrong demographically and socioeconomically. These places are particularly vulnerable cities or counties, and not necessarily all of the county, the whole county or the entire city, but the part where it's relatively poor, like Baltimore City is to Maryland as a whole or parts of D.C. are to other parts of D.C.

So to save lives, given all of this that I've shown you, I thought of a very silly acronym called "TRY," target, replace and improve.

Target the message to at risk groups. People living in old housing who are poor are the group at most risk of dying in a fire. Help these poor people. Not only do they live in an old, crummy house, but now their chance of drying in a fire are

continually rising relative to yours. 1 2 That's awful. It cries out for something 3 to be done for these people. They don't deserve this fate. 4 Replace things. lot 5 There are 6 interventions that we can do, many that we've already 7 done, but many that we can do that will really help these people. 8 9 I live in a house that's 51 years old. They don't have 10 know how crappy these houses are. 11 polarized plugs in them. I don't have GFI sockets. didn't have until recently GFI sockets in my bathroom. 12 13 I didn't have until recently a breaker box in the I had a fuse box. 14 basement. I have done all of these 15 I replaced. 16 things in my house because I know the data, and I know 17 where the fires are, and I know what has got to be 18 done and for relatively low sums of money a lot of these interventions can be done, not all of them, but 19 many of them. 20

And of course, improve the rehabilitation codes because as these houses are sold, there's a

21

1	chance when someone buys this house they're going to
2	rehab it, and when they rehab it, that's the chance to
۷	reliab it, and when they reliab it, that's the chance to
3	turn a 100 year old house that's in crummy condition
4	into essentially a brand new house with a 120 year
5	shell exterior, and that would go a long way toward
6	making that house as safe as a brand new house.
7	But the key thing is the concentration of
8	fire deaths is going to continue to be increasingly
9	concentrated in these areas where you've got both
10	poverty and old stock.
11	Thank you very much.
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Thank you, Elliot.
13	MR. EISENBERG: It's a pleasure to be
14	here.
15	(Applause.)
16	MR. EISENBERG: My name and information is
17	on the back of the last form. I would be happy to
18	entertain questions and look forward to talking to any
19	of you in the future.
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Questions?
21	MR. PARR: I'm Shaun Parr.

1	of emergency response, both fire and EMS, be an
2	artefact in this kind of analysis?
3	MR. EISENBERG: I'm not sure I get the
4	question.
5	MR. PARR: Well, I would assume there are
6	going to be some variation from county to county, for
7	instance, in the adequacy of their emergency response
8	capabilities, which could have some effect on the
9	number of incidents.
10	MR. EISENBERG: True, but over 458
11	MR. PARR: On the number of deaths.
12	MR. EISENBERG: The question is over 450
13	counties is there a systematic difference in fire
14	response rates by county characteristics. I don't
15	know. We know that in rural counties fire death rates
16	are much higher than urban counties in general. In
17	the county houses are five miles away. When the fire
18	goes up, the house is gone. They're not going to come
19	in time.
20	Because these counties are all relatively
21	large counties, 450 largest, I would assume that their
22	fire departments are relatively similar from across

1	county. I didn't get data on budgets, you know, per
2	capita budgets.
3	MR. PARR: Yeah, and obviously I'm
4	thinking more specifically locally knowing that the
5	District compared to its suburban counterparts
6	probably has not given the resources to those services
7	that might have, you know, allowed for comparability.
8	MR. EISENBERG: If that's the case, that
9	might be a relatively inexpensive intervention to
LO	build a couple more firehouses, maybe.
L1	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Denzel, did you have a
L2	question?
L3	MR. NOBLE: Yes. Was Montgomery County
L4	aware of this survey or any other survey, seeing that
L5	they only recently passed the legislation?
L6	I know Montgomery County had been toying
L7	with the sprinkler requirement for the last ten years
L8	when we adopted a sprinkler system, but they see fit
L9	to adopt the sprinkler provision only last year.
20	Were they aware of this survey?
21	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Identify yourself,
22	please.

MR. HABER: Mike Haber.

I represented MNCBIA when talking to the Montgomery County Council. Unfortunately Elliot's report was not available at that point. Elliot would have been a much better spokesman than I was.

It was a feel good measure. I mean, they did not want to think about the problems that are being addressed now. Are you, you know, taking off from Elliot's premise? Are you really addressing the problem by putting sprinklers in houses.

Yes, today's new houses become old houses, and I've heard that from every fire official I've ever discussed this with, but today's houses are built very differently than they were 50 years ago or even 20 years ago.

So I think that, you know, as Elliot gets into more and more data you'll see that there is a difference between a 20 year old house in 1970 and a 20 year old house in 2001 or 2004.

I think that, Denzel, the basic response I got was, "Hey, the fire marshals have told us this. We have a very wealthy county. We can afford. It's

just another couple of thousand dollars a house. So it was a feel good measure.

What we're running into right now is with WSSC, and I think WASA would have the same problem, is, well, what are the size of the service lines. What size meters do you put in? Do you when you put in this sprinkler system have to dig up -- you know, in D.C. particularly, you have many existing service lines. Will you have to replace a three-quarter inch non-lead line --

(Laughter.)

MR. HABER: -- with a one inch line?

You know, there are a whole bunch of factors like that. So basically Montgomery County said we're doing it and now we're dealing with the problems. I think that, you know, my projection is we're going to see the same sort of graphs as they see in Prince George's.

I was on the Prince George's sprinkler task force in 1987. Sixteen fire officials and two builders, and it was passed 14 to two.

(Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

I think that logic hasn't MR. HABER: really entered this system. I mean, one thing in this argument, and that's what I think Elliot's study helps people think about; one thing logically he didn't list everybody knows: wired here, but hard smoke NAHB on a national level has promoted a detectors. model legislation that at the time of sale of a house, that somebody would have to put in hard wire smoke detectors with battery back-ups so that you have those two, and you know, there's much longer term batteries.

But the realtors have a big problem with that because they don't want to be in charge of policing that, but certainly in the existing building codes on rehabs, as Elliot has pointed out, that's something that really can help bring up, increase the amount of safety.

I mean if the District was able somehow to fund a proactive program in lower income areas with older housing stock for a hard wired smoke detector program, I think you'd get a lot more bang for your buck.

MR. EISENBERG: Let me add a comment to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

this. I'm going to put my hat on now as a housing economist, not as a fire guy.

If you impose sprinklers, the cost of sprinklers on new housing anywhere, it's a large cost. It's four, 5,000 bucks a house. That means if you buy a new house in D.C., you're looking at a house that costs four or \$5,000 more than it did before or, you know, it doesn't have Corian countertops. It has Formica countertops instead or it doesn't have a second bath. It has only a bath and a half.

You've raised the cost of that house. As a new buyer coming to D.C., I have a choice. I can buy that new house that now costs four or \$5,000 more or I can buy an existing house which doesn't have this fire sprinkler in it and, therefore, is a little cheaper. But everyone tries to avoid getting the new house that has the sprinkler and costs more money, they drive up the prices or the existing houses, not all houses, and they don't all go up by 5,000 bucks because they all aren't really comparable to those new houses, but to the extent they are comparable, they will all experience a boost up in their price because

the few new houses that are built each year will have 1 2 a sprinkler. 3 contrast, if have mandated Ву you installation of hard wired backup, electric backup 4 smoke detectors on sale, you're not going to get this 5 Something 6 bump up in the cost of existing houses. 7 about given D.C. and its housing to think affordability problems. Adding 5,000 bucks a house is 8 9 a big deal. I'm David Bardin. 10 MR. BARDIN: I have two 11 questions, one picking up on Shaun's. 12 Focus more on the EMS than the fire 13 fighting because we've had a series of problems here that it takes the EMS folks longer to get to our 14 15 callers than is typical in the region, nationally or 16 the target for the city. 17 In your research is there some indication 18 that the long time trends or longitudinal trends in any way are related to improved medical technology? 19 20 You'd think that perhaps something that 21 caused a smoke inhalation death 30 years ago can now 22 be treated in a way that it leads to a recovery, a

1	survival if you know
2	MR. EISENBERG: Absolutely. It has got to
3	be in there. There is no question that I'm picking
4	that up somehow, yes. I don't have the data on that,
5	but it's certainly in there. No question.
6	MR. BARDIN: My second question is
7	strictly on the sprinkler issue, which is the issue on
8	the table. Did you try to use your data in any way to
9	look at before sprinkler/after sprinkler? Are there
10	enough counties and enough data?
11	Well, you told us Prince George's County.
12	That's one anecdote.
13	MR. EISENBERG: But it's a good story.
14	It's a very good story because it has been done long
15	enough ago such that the effects ought to begin to be
16	felt now. Don't forget it's going to take 20 years or
17	15, 20 years before you can have any impact because
18	all of the existing stock doesn't have sprinklers in
19	it. They're just as unsafe as they were.
20	MR. BARDIN: Well, look. It's low, to
21	start with.
	ll en

MR. EISENBERG: Right.

1	MR. BARDIN: And it's one county, and
2	you're looking at hundreds of counties. Do you have
3	any have you sorted any of the data about your
4	counties in terms of do they have a sprinkler
5	ordinance and, if so, when do they install it?
6	MR. EISENBERG: I don't, but I will do
7	that next. That's going to be next on my agenda.
8	MR. BARDIN: That would be very
9	interesting.
LO	MR. EISENBERG: I would be happy to share
L1	it with this group.
L2	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I'm sorry. Howard
L3	wondered if he could make a quick point and then you
L4	pass it back to Joan. We'll do that.
L5	MR. EBENSTEIN: Howard Ebenstein.
L6	Hi, Dave. How are you doing?
L7	I'm not a sprinkler expert, but I just
L8	couldn't help but wonder. We're focusing in on deaths
L9	and obviously that's where the focus should be, but
20	there's also the issue of property damage. You can
21	have nobody dying and you can have somebody's house,

you know, become a pile of ashes. So have you taken a

1	look at property damage protection or reduced property
2	damage losses or however the insurance company is
3	going to measure that and how that correlates with the
4	use of sprinklers?
5	MR. EISENBERG: I have not, but in the
6	next level, in the next analysis, will look at the
7	counties that have it, have imposed sprinklers, and
8	see if there's been a dramatic or significant
9	reduction.
10	MR. EBENSTEIN: There was one other thing
11	that I wanted to ask you about that caught my
12	attention. It was one of the early slides. You added
13	two things. One was the income and the other was
14	the
15	MR. EISENBERG: New stock.
16	MR. EBENSTEIN: Yeah, the age of the
17	stock, and you added those, and I couldn't help but
18	wonder: can they be added or is there an interactive
19	or a
20	MR. EISENBERG: This model did not have an
21	interaction effect.
22	MR. EBENSTEIN: Because there could be

1	some overlapping between the two.
2	MR. EISENBERG: There could be.
3	MR. EBENSTEIN: And the whole may be less
4	than the sum of the parts.
5	MR. EISENBERG: But the model that I ran,
6	the model that I settled on at least for this stage in
7	the research was linear in the terms, and it was
8	additive. Yes, you are right. It could be.
9	MS. STOGIS: Joan Stogis.
10	First, just a comment on Howard's question
11	about the sprinkler system and property damage, a
12	personal anecdote which I've heard with a couple of
13	people off line.
14	I live in a single family house in
15	Maryland. When my homeowner's insurance came up for
16	renewal, I asked the insurance company two
17	hypothetical questions. One, what reduction would I
18	get if I had a monitored burglar alarm system, 250
19	bucks. Well, that is the monitoring cost pretty much.
20	So that's rather attractive.
21	What would they reduce my premium by if I
22	put in a residential sprinkler system? Seventy

dollars. So there's no correlation to the investment necessary. So at least the insurance companies are not --

MR. EISENBERG: Finding it.

MS. STOGIS: -- not seeing a benefit.

Now, it doesn't mean insurance companies -- I guess
they are reactive more than proactive, but that's
interesting.

Going back to the sort of general really fascinating things you've pointed out in the District of Columbia -- this is a little bit off the immediate sprinkler issue, but we had this Homestart legislation a couple of years ago which really led us to now be with a various of the international existing buildings code, but part of that which I didn't pay any attention to because it was outside of the purview of this committee had to do with financial incentives to encourage home ownership.

So I'm wondering -- and this probably isn't hours, but it might be somebody's -- but is there anything in there that would encourage buyers of older houses to make these upgrades which you've

identified as improving safety? 1 2 That would be something that somebody in D.C. would be good to look at, the council's --3 MR. EISENBERG: Theoretically it would be 4 a lovely idea, but --5 The other question I have is 6 MS. STOGIS: 7 apparently the impetus for the Homestart legislation was that D.C. has a lower rate of home ownership than 8 9 comparable cities, and I wondered if in your analysis you found any relationship between rental versus 10 11 owner-occupied by --Interestingly I didn't 12 MR. EISENBERG: Ι 13 tried that in the model a number of different ways. included instead of having incomes or wealth, I tried 14 I included multi-fam., single fam. percentages 15 rent. 16 in the county. It didn't show up. That doesn't mean it's not relevant. 17 it may mean is that within my sample of 457 counties 18 that are all relatively large and relatively urban, 19 20 there aren't great differences in those ratios across 21 the counties, and therefore, the effect just isn't

I'm not prepared to say it doesn't

showing up.

matter. I can at least say I can't find it.

MS. MONTPLAISIR: Hello. I'm Gail Montplaisir. I'm from the developer and builder side, and I work here in D.C.

And we have been talking about this in the existing building, existing structures subcommittee, and there are several things that I would like to bring up.

From the builder's side, the gentleman on the end brought up the issue about increasing the size of the water service for single family homes, as well as it's the same for multi-family homes, too, but that is a big issue, and if it's not being looked at as a part of the overall discussion, it ought to be because that is a very expensive proposition. It is not inexpensive at all.

I do this regularly. I do it for small buildings. I do it for single family homes, and it is not an inconsiderable expense, and if we're saying four to \$5,000, that's probably much less than what it would be when you have to add in your upgrade of your water, and generally the lines in D.C. do require an

upgrade of the size of the line to be able to accommodate a sprinkler system. That's number one.

Number two, from the insurance side, I also have to deal with this and have also dealt with it on an anecdotal basis also. From the insurance side we have a couple of issues. Does your house burn down and become ashes? Do you have more that's preserved if it's not?

I think that the statistics show, and I don't have a citation for it, but I'll be happy to look for it, is that frequently the sprinkler systems themselves cause more damage than many of the fires. Now, obviously it depends upon the size of the fire, but it does happen that the fire, you know, can be put out very easily, but the sprinkler system goes off. They don't just stop as soon as the fire is out. They keep going and going and going and going, and the interior of the house and all of the belongings become demolished because of the water damage.

And then on the anecdotal side, I just recently had one of my rental units have a fire sprinkler blow off because there had been a number of

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

heads that in the last several years that have been found to be defective, and it's over the last ten years. And it comes up and then they replace them and then it comes up and they replace them, but they don't advise people when a sprinkler head is found to be defective. It's simply put out there. If you happen to catch it, fine. If you don't, fine.

The sprinkler head blew off. defective. Within -- I don't know -- 30 seconds there were six inches of water in the unit where the people It flooded the building next door also, were living. and the insurance company would only pay for the damages to the interior of our unit that were things like drywall, carpeting and things like that. replaced nothing from the unit next door that has its entire floor ruined. They wouldn't pay for any of the repair work that had to be done because that's considered a maintenance item, and the companies are not up to speed, where they ought to be if we're considering this type of legislation, believe, as far as fire sprinklers in all new housing.

MR. EISENBERG: If I may chime in, a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

concern I've had about sprinklers, I don't know how long they last. I think that's a really important issue. Not many things in a house last 100 -- some things in a house last 100 years. In a house floors last 100 years and walls. Things with water in them don't generally last 100 years or 50 years or 40 years. I don't know what happens at that point.

What do you do then? What is the cost to fix that problem when it happens? What do you do?

I'm not an engineer. I don't know.

MR. PARR: David.

MR. BARDIN: David Bardin again.

I just want to add a couple of pieces of information on the estimated cost of replacing the line, the service line. This is indirect. So bear with me carefully. WASA has put forward recently the cost of replacing -- these are replacing lead service lines with copper where there's no change in the size of the line, but their estimate -- it's not an estimate. It's the average they've experienced in several hundred replacements in the last few months between the water main in the middle of the street and

the property line is just over \$10,000, to which they add that the continuation on the property owner's side might be 2,000, but that's just an estimate.

Only a couple of years ago in a discussion, in an analysis of this issue, the WASA estimate of the first part of the public side, but an estimate, not actual experience, was about half of that.

So I can't say that these recent several hundred are necessarily typical, but certainly one of the factors that has happened here in the District is the repaying requirements of the change in Department of transportation, that when you cut into a if the street has been rebuilt, so-called street moratorium street, a wider cut, you have to pay more; the cost, it bears analysis, but when you're thinking about it, these latest WASA figures, and it would obviously be more because there would be more replacements, are worth asking yourself about, and this is without regard to who bears the cost, whether it's the developer cost that Gail was talking about when the developer is implementing something or a city

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cost when it's a replacement. 1 2 MR. PARR: Thank you. 3 Marc. MR. FETTERMAN: Hi. Marc Fetterman. 4 The comment about the life of sprinkler 5 6 system is a wonderful one as someone who loves and 7 tries to focus his work on this older housing stock that you're criticizing. One of the issues --8 I live in an old house 9 MR. EISENBERG: 10 though. 11 MR. FETTERMAN: One of the issues that I've noticed that many of us don't take advantage 12 13 of -- and this is a challenge, I think, for our city -- my understanding that a smoke detector has a 14 ten-year life and that we're supposed to replace our 15 16 smoke detectors after a certain amount of 17 They're not good forever. 18 Obviously that's a much lower cost, but if were fortunate enough to 19 we get 20 detectors in every house, that's not the end of it 21 just were talking about it, as we

sprinklers, the smoke detectors have elements inside

do not last forever. So it's a multi-step that 1 2 challenge that we have ahead of us. 3 MR. EISENBERG: You're absolutely right, I agree wholeheartedly. 4 yes. CHAIRPERSON KRESS: 5 Thank you. 6 Anymore questions? 7 (No response.) CHAIRPERSON KRESS: If not, thank you very 8 9 much for coming and visiting with us, and I think that 10 this helpful in many directions and 11 particularly to the existing structures committee. don't 12 think that necessarily what was we were 13 expecting, but I think it was overall very helpful to us, and I really appreciate your taking the time to 14 15 come visit us. 16 MR. EISENBERG: Thank you very much. 17 Thank you. 18 (Applause.) 19 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: With everyone's permission, unless pressing 20 there is some old 21 business, I will just reiterate what was I understand to be established at the last meeting, which is that 22

at our next meeting Denzel and DCRA will hopefully have the codes and have the code sooner, but certainly have the knowledge about them.

Also, the amendments that we feel, that DCRA feels and our own members feel should be put on an expedited basis to evaluate, there were several that were mentioned last time that we need to discuss, and so if you have any additional ones, do let Sara know and we'll have a list. Sprinklers are one of the issues, which is why we have this presentation today. That was one that was listed very high that we reevaluate in its completeness, and I think we took a big step today.

Race permits were mentioned. Sign, special signs, revocation of permits, and the date regarding the elevator transition for the changes to the elevator regulations and the date in which they take effect. That was the other very large issue that was brought up to us.

Yes, Mr. Bardin.

MR. BARDIN: On the elevators, DCRA has announced at least informally in an E-mail I've seen

NEAL R. GROSS

1	from Denzel's Deputy that that July 31 date is going
2	to be maybe it has been is going to be rolled
3	for a year at least in the <u>D.C. Register</u> , and they've
4	also indicated
5	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I'm sorry. It has
6	been published?
7	MR. BARDIN: I don't know if it has been
8	published yet, but it's going to be very shortly, I
9	think.
10	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Is that your
11	understanding, Denzel?
12	MR. NOBLE: Yeah, the notice to extend the
13	2004 date was supposed to have been posted. I'm not
14	sure if it has.
15	MR. BARDIN: But the second point that
16	they made in the E-mail was that DCRA looked forward
17	to developing a rolling compliance program.
18	And so my question, Madam Chair, is
19	whether the Director has yet reached a conclusion as
20	to whether the development of that rolling compliance
21	is something on which DCRA would like this committee
22	to have some input, advisory input to.

1	MR. NOBLE: Yes, I can answer that.
2	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Thank you.
3	MR. NOBLE: The reason for presenting the
4	rolling compliance is that we plan to bring that to
5	the committee. We'd be looking for input from this
6	committee as to how this rolling compliance would
7	work.
8	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: So that would remain
9	on our
10	MR. NOBLE: Yes, that would remain. And
11	if you
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: expedited list.
13	MR. NOBLE: For those of you who went to
14	the hearing at
15	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: On October 22nd?
16	MR. NOBLE: regarding codes
17	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: It was October 22nd.
18	MR. NOBLE: Yeah, and again, at the budget
19	hearing, it's one of the issues that's on the
20	committee chair's radar, the elevator issue, and she's
21	waiting to see exactly what we are going to do in
22	terms of, one, extending the date, which is what I

The notices would soon be published, and Shaun said. 1 2 and I have had some discussions about that. 3 And the language for rolling the compliance, which would even extend the date beyond 4 the 2005 date. 5 6 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Ι think I saw Jim 7 Lowery here. Are you aware of this so that you might be prepared to either say something now or at least 8 9 for tomorrow? 10 MR. LOWERY: I'm Jim Lowery. I'm on the 11 subcommittee for the elevator codes. And as far as the rolling compliance, no, 12 13 really familiar with what you quys expecting as a rolling compliance, and we did submit a 14 date, and we haven't got any feedback until now on how 15 16 you want to do that. So, yes, I would like to know 17 what you're expecting for me tomorrow. 18 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: We'll talk about that just hearing about 19 later. Ι am this 20 compliance myself. Not everyone, I don't think, other 21 members here have been aware, but we'll talk as soon 22 as we complete this meeting.

Thank you. 1 2 MR. NOBLE: At the last meeting I did 3 mention about the fact that we'll be coming up with regarding some language the rolling compliance. 4 However, I will leave that. We'd like committee input 5 in providing that, in developing their language as how 6 7 they're rolling. I don't have any set ideas of how it is 8 9 supposed to work. The only --I just think we should 10 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: 11 mention that because this is of concern to many, many people in the community, and that without giving a 12 13 solution we should say it's under study and that there will be additional time. 14 15 MR. NOBLE: Yes. 16 CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Did you want to say 17 something, Shaun? 18 MR. PARR: Thank you. Shaun Parr. Well, Vince had mentioned this at the last 19 meeting, the intent to extend the deadline for the 20 effectiveness 21 of the **ASME** 17.3 standard, Ι

mentioned that also at the same time that it was an

issue, as Denzel was just saying, that was brought up at the hearing on the proposed adoption because the board, in fact, adopted it in January, and various parties were looking at it and were concerned about it, but it actually was brought up first at that hearing by Chairperson Ambrose because she was concerned about the impact of a "one size fits all" compliance date, and so --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And I think many of us individually had been receiving concerns from the general public on this issue.

MR. PARR: So my organization and our testimony that we raised the prospect of some sort of a rolling phased implementation approach, which the executive branch also spoke favorably to; Mr. Ambrose very much liked that. So I think there's a cord on developing an alternative to the single implementation date or effective date for the ASME 17.3 standard.

And so what has to happen is now because officially what's out there is the extended deadline of July 31, 2004. So that has got to be officially extended. The purpose of the extension would be to

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

develop the rolling implementation approach to get it adopted, get it in place before the extended deadline expires.

The point ultimately is not that ASME 17.3 as currently drafted would become immediately effective, but rather it would eventually become effective pursuant to a process that has yet to be --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And it might well be best in Chapter 1, administrative. The precedent here, of course, is sprinklering, when we started sprinklering our office buildings and our commercial buildings and what the DCRA and the director developed was that phased implementation, and I believe that was handled in Chapter 1, was it not?

Well, we can decide where it goes at a different time, but certainly it's on our expedited list and needs to be because of the July 31st deadline. We should have something, and so hopefully that would go at the same time as the other expedited issues.

MR. NOBLE: Again, the July 31st date becomes mute once that notice is published extending

1	the deadline to 2005.
2	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Oh, okay.
3	MR. PARR: And that's, I think, a good
4	point. I mean, while the official publication still
5	needs to occur, I mean, I think Denzel has been fairly
6	unequivocal in various forums at this point about that
7	intent, and my point in recapping the recent history
8	was just to say that I think everyone is in accord.
9	I mean, his boss, the director of the
LO	department, the oversight chairman of the council
L1	at this point no one wants to see that standard become
L2	effective on July 31, 2004.
L3	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I'm sorry. so the
L4	answer is you're going to just publish a change to the
L5	code?
L6	MR. NOBLE: No, no. We'll be publishing
L7	an extension to the implementation date of that ASME
L8	standard.
L9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Okay. Without the
20	process.
21	MR. NOBLE: Right.
22	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Right now we're just

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	going to get to the extension.
2	MR. NOBLE: It's to develop the process.
3	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And it's for one year?
4	MR. NOBLE: Well, it probably is going to
5	be through 2005, December 31st, 2004.
6	MR. PARR: One of the things that I've
7	been I mean, I think the initial task is going to
8	be to identify as best we can the number of cabs
9	affected. I mean DCRA knows that it licenses
LO	approximately 10,000 elevator cabs. How many of those
L1	are noncompliant.
L2	And then of those that are, so you have
L3	got to identify the universe first and then develop a
L4	scheme for prioritizing. So, you know, we're going to
L5	have to identify the universe of affected elevator
L6	cabs first and then go forward with some sort of
L7	logical system for who's first and who's later on.
L8	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: All right. Well,
L9	we'll take this up in more detail later.
20	Jim Lowery wanted to say something. I'm
21	sorry.
22	MR. LOWERY: Jim Lowery, D.C. elevator

codes subcommittee.

The letter that we recommended was that all existing elevators in the District of Columbia must comply by July 31st, 2005, not 2004, and also at that same time, we would have extensions, if need be, and that that would be not in compliance until 2007, and I wasn't sure if everybody is aware of that or not.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I am not. Do you have an extra copy of that? We will make sure we copy it and get it to everyone.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ NOBLE: What's that? I'm not sure what that is.

MS. STOGIS: Joan Stogis.

I just wanted to say it seems to me that as Jerrily mentioned, the provisions for sprinklering existing highrise buildings might be a good way of approaching it, and in that case the scoping and the requirement would be in the existing buildings section. However, it refers you to Chapter 1 for the covenant which is the legal document that puts this into effect.

And so that could be a model to start examining the elevator issue from.

MR. NOBLE: Yes, and that's what I meant when I said that all I'm concerned now is that on August 1st, our inspectors don't go into buildings and start shutting them down. That's the first concern. So extending that drop dead date of December 31st is to avoid that.

In addition to that, then this committee can then in their existing structures committee or the elevator committee come up with language of how we are going to implement or develop the role in compliance, what criteria we're going to use for the role in compliance when building should а come into compliance, and that's what like you said if something that we want to look at what we did for sprinkler system, maybe that's a good start and modify that to fit the elevator.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: It certainly needs study, and I think we send that to the various committees.

David.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. BARDIN: Madam Chair, let's just talk about the process that we follow in the Building Code Advisory Committee. The subcommittees make recommendations to the full committee.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Absolutely.

MR. BARDIN: The full committee doesn't act on substantive matters without giving notice to all of the members that it will come up not today, but at some next meeting or future meeting of the full committee.

In this case I would think that the discussion already suggests that the full committee is going to want the input of more than one subcommittee and maybe more than two subcommittees --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Absolutely.

MR. BARDIN: -- so that you have a fully discussion, and that means to me that the question of the extension, which I think is already decided, if I understand it, by the department in consultation and may already have been published; I understand it will be published in one of the issues this month. Whether it's last Friday, next Friday I don't know.

1	Frankly, if the Director and the
2	Administrator have decided that it's more realistic to
3	have an extension not of one year but all the way to
4	December 31, 2005, I don't have to remind you, Madam
5	Chair, of the procedures that we follow in this
6	committee and the fact that we like to be thoughtful.
7	We like to have input from many directions. If
8	there's disagreement, we like to have it fully
9	debated.
10	So that I personally would welcome the
11	extra handful of months to December 31 to work on
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Well, first of all,
13	that is out of our control. We're only advisory. So
14	as much as our subcommittees advise us as a whole and
15	we make decisions, we advise DCRA, who is the Mayor's
16	agent, who makes the final decision of what goes
17	ahead.
18	So they can bypass us, and we hope they
19	don't typically, but they could bypass us and take
20	this action to extend this date to whatever they want
21	to extend it to.

MR. BARDIN: But, Madam Chair, what I'm

1	trying to do is to be helpful to our new elevator
2	subcommittee, which doesn't technically exist yet
3	because we haven't amended our bylaws yet.
4	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: That's the next on my
5	list, is bylaws.
6	MR. BARDIN: But obviously they want to
7	work in the framework of the bylaws of this full
8	committee which have been in effect for many years,
9	and subcommittees can't bypass the full committee
10	either. A subcommittee as a subcommittee can't give
11	advice outside our process.
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: No, they cannot.
13	MR. BARDIN: So I think it has got to be
L4	very clear that what the subcommittee does is aimed
15	toward the full committee and
16	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Absolutely.
17	MR. BARDIN: flagged to other
18	subcommittees that might have an interest shared all
19	around and discussed thoroughly all around.
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Well, that's why as we
21	get back on track we look for monthly reports from
22	subcommittees so that we are aware of what they're

doing, and if we need interaction with other committees, such as existing structures, that is then called to our attention, and we suggest that the committee chairs talk.

But quickly to move on because I have

But quickly to move on because I have promised everyone that we will move on, we're not making a decision here today on this; we will be discussing it.

Thank you, again.

On our agenda -- go ahead.

MS. STOGIS: One other, and I truly am not sure if this is an urgent issue or not, I have been sort of corresponding by E-mail with a couple of people, that I am concerned, and this is especially in light of the presentation on fires, that we don't have in place right now provisions for one and two family dwellings, for alterations to existing one and two family dwellings, and --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: From what I've been reading, there's some disagreement.

MS. STOGIS: Yeah, Amanda feels that it's covered, and so I'm not sure if it's an urgent issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

It is something --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I think that it's an issue.

MS. STOGIS: -- look at in the next cycle at least.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: No, I think it's an urgent issue that needs to be resolved. Whether it is resolved as one of our expedited issues or part of this cycle, I think depends on what your committee as a whole decides. I think you should bring it back to us as the committee and what you think it should be.

This is not a complete list. Before I move, let me just say the list I have right now is the beginning of a list. It can change. I'm asking for everyone to have their subcommittee meetings and to bring forth any other expected issues that they feel needs the go-ahead of the typical cycle so that we can set up a schedule to focus on those issues, get those resolved, and then move on to the rest of our regular cycle.

Also, with what we heard from Dave with ICC today, we might want to cycle some of our issues

to perhaps share with them I believe he said August. so hopefully we can have a proposal and discuss next week once we decide what the important expedited amendments are, we can put together a schedule that maybe even incorporates communications with ICC.

Also urgent, which I have been seeing E-mails, which is really in the issues and policy subcommittee, from what I understand Marc is leading the efforts to look at the revisions to our bylaws, and I think it seems to me from what I've seen you're well on your way to some suggestions. Am I correct or not?

MR. FETTERMAN: Yes. Marc Fetterman.

And I've gotten comments from Joan and George Papadopolous, as well as David Bardin, and if anyone else has any issues that they would like to bring up with regard to the bylaws, I would love to receive it.

And our goal would be to then bring these suggestions back to the entire committee for discussions, but we want to be as efficient as we can about this and encourage anyone to get to me specific

comments that they might have with regard to the existing bylaws.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Thank you.

The last thing I have on my list is again to remind people of membership. Sara got a new interpretation for those of you who haven't read your E-mails, and it is that they are telling her for the people who work for the government agencies or an ANC person does not need to be reappointed; that they serve at the mayor's pleasure, and so, therefore, we don't have to go through the reappointment.

David just did his, but everyone else does, and for those members, please encourage and I will be saying it tomorrow as well; for those people who would like to be a part of our process and are not a part of it and coordinate with Sara, we ask that you get your forms in and the letter from the organization that's sponsoring you.

However, if you just want to serve on a committee and focus on that one facet, you don't need to be officially sworn in. It just means you can come

NEAL R. GROSS

to these meetings even. It just means you are not able to vote formally on all of the amendments and issues that come before this committee.

So I just want to remind you if you don't have your membership information in, our appointments expire. I say "our." I'm out of it, ha, ha. they expire April 1st, 2004, and so we would really like to have everyone sworn in before the first of 2004, and so that we can continue our process seamlessly and without question.

You do not have to be resident of the District of Columbia. I don't know if there's anybody, Dave, in your organization that would want to be any part of this, but certainly they could represent your organization and be a representative of you and be a help to us if you would so wish. but I just wanted to remind everybody that.

Before we adjourn and I need all of the chairmen to stay, the subcommittees, because we're going to quickly talk about what's going to be presented tomorrow, is there any other business before we -- yes. Joan Stogis.

MS. STOGIS: Three quick items. One is do we have an up to date roster that can be circulated by E-mail? I mean there are new faces. Plus I'm bumping into finding people's E-mail addresses don't work and this sort of thing.

MS. BARDIN: I'm in the process of doing that.

MS. STOGIS: Great.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And she's coordinating with -- because we're getting new information as the forms are coming in, and so she is also coordinating with boards and commission, which is why we ask that we get a copy as well, because in the past -- and not to say anything about boards and commission, but they have misplaced a lot of information and not gotten information when it gets typed up correctly.

So by us also having it Sara is able to double check the information, and she has been meeting, has already met at least once, if not twice, with staff at boards and commissions to make sure where things are, and out of that we will try to create the best new list that we can because that E-

Τ	mail list is incredibly important, and so
2	MS. STOGIS: My second question is: is
3	our Website functional? And if so, do we have
4	procedures of how whatever it is
5	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I didn't bring that up
6	because I thought that was going to take a lot of
7	time. To my knowledge it is not functional, and I
8	don't know where it stands. We need to double check
9	with the gentleman who was putting it together.
10	Can you answer anything for us on that,
11	Denzel?
12	We need to double check on that, and we do
13	need to have procedures. I understand that was
14	discussed last time. How as it last how were we
15	going to proceed with the procedures? We're
16	MS. BARDIN: On submitting
17	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: On submitting
18	information for the Website.
19	MS. BARDIN: Just that there needs to be a
20	form, some standard form that we have for each
21	subcommittee before they give it to their chair,
22	before it goes to Woody.

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I would think issues 1 2 and policies should be handling that. I will ask. 3 Armando has not arrived because along with that is our typical work sheet that we put all of the amendments 4 So, one, you're talking more of a routing slip of 5 two, 6 information and then, the information, 7 proposed amendments themselves. And we can certainly pull up from last 8 9 year that work sheet, but I think issues and policies 10 should reevaluate it, and two, formally ask them --11 remind me, Sara -- to put together a transmittal sheet, if you will, that could be used. 12 13 That was going to be my last MS. STOGIS: because really existing 14 question, and Ι ask it 15 structures this time is in really good shape thanks to it just received a comparison --16 17

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I saw that.

MS. STOGIS: of the published international existing buildings code and RDC version so that we know what we need to do to turn it into a published volume plus local amendments. We could begin shaping that up, I think, very --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

18

19

20

21

1	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Weren't you a part of
2	the meeting? Was Joan here? Were you part of the
3	meeting?
4	Why don't you contact what was his
5	name? Woody Sampson, and it's just
6	woody.sampson@dc.gov. Feel free to contact him
7	directly especially since you were part of meeting
8	with him. Sara has been in touch with him, and
9	basically he just sent a page with some lists on it.
LO	We don't know how it's going to work or whatnot, but I
L1	think feel free to follow up and say, "I'm ready and
L2	what's the next step?"
L3	I think it helps to hear from some of the
L4	members rather than just staff and people within
L5	government. I know for sure I carried a lot more
L6	weight when I was on the private side instead of when
L7	I was on the public side. So feel free to contact him
L8	directly.
L9	MS. STOGIS: Okay. Will do.
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Marc?
21	MR. FETTERMAN: One quick thing. Joan and
22	Denzel, I mentioned to each of you by E-mail that the

1	D.C. Register that I got did not have the entire
2	existing structure's code in it, and I was wondering,
3	hoping mine was the only copy, but fearing it probably
4	wasn't, and how we were addressing this issue.
5	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Mine as well.
6	MR. NOBLE: The last information, they are
7	somewhere along the line that some chapters were left
8	out again.
9	MR. FETTERMAN: Only four chapters.
LO	MR. NOBLE: I don't know. I don't know
L1	how that happened because we went
L2	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Jim, I need you back.
L3	Thank you.
L4	MR. NOBLE: We sent the entire package
L5	over.
L6	MR. FETTERMAN: Are they going to
L7	republish the whole thing?
L8	MR. NOBLE: They're going to republish the
L9	whole thing. That's what I was told.
20	MR. FETTERMAN: When?
21	MR. NOBLE: I'll have to check with
22	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Is it all on the

1	Website now? I mean, because this is going to come up
2	tomorrow. Is the whole thing on the Website?
3	MR. NOBLE: On the Website you have the
4	original document.
5	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I can't go ahead
6	and say it.
7	MS. BARDIN: Also it still says "proposed"
8	on the Website. I had somebody ask me a question
9	about that yesterday.
10	MR. NOBLE: Which Website you went to?
11	MS. BARDIN: Yours, the DCRA.
12	MR. NOBLE: No, no, no. If you go to the
13	Office of Documents' Website under the Office of the
14	Secretary, when you look on the agency, I had I
15	don't bring it here. I'll have to find it you'll
16	find the <u>D.C. Register</u> with the entire publication.
17	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: With the entire.
18	Bring that along tomorrow because I think we're going
19	to need to give that to people because you can't just
20	send them to the <u>Register</u> because
21	MR. NOBLE: The main, yes, and the same
22	site that you would go for this, but you have to go

1	through the Office of the Secretary.
2	MS. BARDIN: It's os.dc.gov.
3	MR. FETTERMAN: So, Denzel, you need to
4	remove the building code form your Website then if
5	there are any differences because I'm also finding it
6	on the DCRA Website.
7	MR. NOBLE: Okay. Yeah, well, the only
8	difference on the DCRA Website and we're going to
9	pull it it still said "proposed" because that's
10	been there since when it was put up there as a
11	proposed, but that's the complete document, including
12	the existing structure.
13	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I don't mean to be
14	critical, but I can tell you that Office of Zoning,
15	when they sent theirs to Office of Documents, what got
16	published was different in several ways than what we
17	sent them, and so I'm just and until you go through
18	page by page, line by line, I would just caution
19	everyone keep the DCRA one and keep a proposed.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MR. NOBLE: I mean, that's what happened
22	because we sent the entire of course, the 16 was

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

dropped out. It was a computer glitch when it went over, but when we sent it over, we made sure we went over the entire document to make sure that it was complete, the existing structures was complete that went over for publication as a --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I'm talking about words changing. Ours is complete. I'm talking about sections changing and words changing.

MR. NOBLE: But what they were supposed to do is just take that document. If you notice, it is just our document that they took and just dropped the numbers in.

I'm going to say this CHAIRPERSON KRESS: to the subcommittee since this has come up, and what we've ended up doing in zoning is basically because there was so much confusion, we've now printed on our site and made word searchable the zoning document published by Office of Documents, and then we've created an errata addendum sheet. And we've gone back in and changed the things that they changed incorrectly because we had to have -- everybody was getting too confused about what was in effect and what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	wasn't in effect.
2	So I think that we, in warning our
3	subcommittees that when they look at this they should
4	be attentive because we might want to also you
5	might want to also put up some kind of an errata sheet
6	if there are problems there.
7	MR. NOBLE: Yes, yes. We did find, and I
8	don't know if anyone noticed it, there was another
9	mistake in the original document in addition to the
10	existing structures that was missing in Chapter 1 from
11	106
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: That's the kind of
13	thing that happened to us. Paragraphs got dropped.
14	MR. NOBLE: from 106 I'll tell you
15	in a minute.
16	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: We gave them an
17	electronic copy.
18	MR. NOBLE: Yeah, we gave them
19	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Proofread, formatted.
20	MR. NOBLE: Yes. In 106.3, if you look at
21	the original document, it went from 106.3; it went to
22	109.2 in this document. All of these pages were left

1	out.
2	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Sorry. I told you.
3	MR. NOBLE: But what they've done, we've
4	pointed out part of this to them, and they are now
5	going to be printing, and yes, they're going to print
6	the errata to catch up with this document, and then
7	they're going to print a completely new document with
8	the entire
9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And that's the one
10	that they will then sell, correct, Denzel?
11	MR. NOBLE: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: So they're not selling
13	these right now, except the few they have.
14	MR. NOBLE: Yes. We told them to hold off
15	and let's get everything cleaned up.
16	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: But since it is in
17	effect, we do have to remind everybody where they can
18	find it on this Website.
19	MR. NOBLE: Yes, you can find this
20	document.
21	MR. FETTERMAN: So we want to go to your
22	Website.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. NOBLE: Our Website has it, I said, as
2	proposed. We can change that to the final, but that's
3	not the official document.
4	MR. FETTERMAN: Because the Office of the
5	Secretary's Website will have the pages missing.
6	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And the paragraphs
7	missing.
8	MR. NOBLE: We had proposed to have for
9	tomorrow, for every member, for every attendee, to
LO	have a disk.
L1	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I heard about those
L2	disks. What's on the disk?
L3	MR. NOBLE: It's the entire document.
L4	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Terrific.
L5	MR. NOBLE: There's a glitch.
L6	(Laughter.)
L7	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Nice thought.
L8	MR. NOBLE: Well, there's a glitch.
L9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Wait a minute. We're
20	finished. We can end and go off the record and then
21	you can tell us about the glitch.
22	Howard?

1	MR. EBENSTEIN: Yeah, I had a couple of
2	questions about the publication of the code. A couple
3	of things.
4	I was looking on Office of the Secretary,
5	Office of Documents, whatever site, a couple of weeks
6	ago. I couldn't find it. I think it would be nice if
7	perhaps the link to that site could be E-mailed out to
8	the members. Then we'll know. We won't have to be
9	poking around.
10	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Sara will do that.
11	MR. EBENSTEIN: Another thing is
12	perhaps well, which is the official version of the
13	code? Is it the one on DCRA's site? Is it the one on
14	Office of the Secretary? Office of Documents?
15	MR. NOBLE: No, no.
16	MR. EBENSTEIN: Well, perhaps, Denzel, you
17	could put a link on the DCRA site that will just link
18	it to Office of the Secretary's site, you know, and
19	then you won't have to then you'll know whatever
20	changes they make will be automatically
21	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: See, at least with
22	zoning we have a different situation where we have

1	orders that have been passed that we can go back to
2	when they get the information wrong. That's not the
3	same situation with these codes. There is nothing.
4	I mean, what we did is just advisory, and
5	so what gets published is what is the law, and so
6	that's why it's so important that this get cleaned up
7	and that there be an official errata sheet to clean it
8	up.
9	MR. EBENSTEIN: The errors that were made
10	in the hard copy, are they correct? Is the correct
11	version on their site? In other words, those few
12	sections that were dropped out of Article I, do they
13	exist electronically on your Website or is it just a
14	publication?
15	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Whose Website? Office
16	of Documents' Website?
17	MR. EBENSTEIN: Office of Documents'
18	Website.
19	MR. NOBLE: No.
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: It's not going to
21	exist on there.
22	MR. NOBLE: No, it's not. If you go to

1	DCRA Website where you have the proposed, that's the
2	document. That has everything in it. Remember we did
3	not change anything from the proposed to the final
4	package.
5	However, when this was sent over to the
6	Office of Documents and they started playing with it,
7	things happened.
8	MR. EBENSTEIN: So the Office of Documents
9	version is the official version even though it's
10	flawed. So
11	MR. FETTERMAN: What's your point?
12	(Laughter.)
13	MR. EBENSTEIN: Well, where do people go?
14	MR. NOBLE: One consolation is that in the
15	beginning of the document, it tells you exactly what's
16	adopted. All the codes are listed there. So eve n
17	though the existing code was not published, it's
18	adopted, if you understand what I mean. The
19	legislation final rulemaking did identify all of the
20	codes that were adopted.
21	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Howard, would you pass

that over to David? Did you have something?

1	MR. BARDIN: A quick piece of advice to
2	DCRA. The next time, whether it's just a small
3	amendment or the whole code cycle, I strongly advise
4	publish the notice of proposed rulemaking, full text,
5	that whole three-quarters inch, half inch, full inch
6	so that anybody can read it whether he's Web literate
7	or not, and when they have once set it up correctly or
8	incorrectly at the Office of Documents, it will save
9	us an awful lot of trouble and money in the long run.
10	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: They can still fool
11	with it here.
12	MR. NOBLE: Let me say that it wasn't our
13	decision not to publish the proposed rules. It was
14	the Office of Documents, because we sent them
15	MR. BARDIN: I know that.
16	MR. NOBLE: We sent the CD as well as the
17	hard copy, and of course, then we put them in the
18	various locations.
19	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: And I would say the
20	format, because we learned this the hard way with
21	Office of Zoning Sara did this for us for the
22	building codes for this format. So we already knew.

1	We had already fought the wars on the format, and we
2	thought we had them all covered, but they still found
3	things they needed to change.
4	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Any last comments?
5	MR. PARR: Not to beat this dead horse too
6	much further, but just to go back to what Howard was
7	getting at, I mean, the Office of the Secretary/Office
8	of Documents' version is the only official enforceable
9	version that's out there. So until that's
10	corrected but that's incomplete.
11	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Yes.
12	MR. PARR: There were some sections that
13	were dropped. Well, eventually, I mean, what we have
14	got to do is make sure that and you know, errata
15	sheets that DCRA might develop and keep on its Website
16	are still ultimately not going to have
17	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Oh, absolutely.
18	MR. PARR: until they have been
19	incorporated into the text. So this
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: I was just explaining
21	zoning is different from building codes. Building
	i i

codes absolutely -- the errata sheet isn't worth

anything until it's done by Office of Documents.

MR. PARR: But at least maybe there's an opportunity here for the Office of Documents to republish at some point a complete and accurate and comprehensive volume, but it's going to be incumbent on all of us to make sure that everything is in there, I mean, as it's supposed to be before they pull the final trigger, and then what they have on their Website has got to be --

CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Well, it would be really nice if they sent the whole thing down to proof because we know what we've sent up was correct. It's what they do with it. I mean, that's what happened with us with zoning and --

MR. NOBLE: The proposed package that we sent forward that's on our Website, that was complete with existing structures, the section that I told you that was missing. That's complete. If you look at our Website, you'll see the entire package.

When we sent it over with the final rule, yes, the existing structure which was J, the very last one somehow was dropped out. There was a computer

1	glitch, and as soon as we found out, we spoke to them,
2	and that's where we did an errata and sent that
3	section over with the errata form for publication,
4	which they were supposed to have done on the 30th of
5	January, and this is what came out.
6	MR. PARR: And without knowing what was in
7	those sections between 106.6 and 109, if you had an
8	enforceability
9	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: You've got a big
10	enforceability issue.
11	MR. PARR: you have a problem. I mean,
12	you simply wouldn't be able to make it stick because
13	it has not been adopted as final.
14	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: That's absolutely my
15	understanding. I think that's good, and again, we've
16	got other things to do, but it's very important to
17	know what the legal status of this is for us as the
18	building code committee, for us as subcommittee chair,
19	and for DCRA because that is something that really
20	needs to be done quickly.
21	MR. EBENSTEIN: Jerrily, one last thing
22	from me. It seems to be somewhat of a mystery what

1	happened over at the Office of Documents, like we sent
2	this thing and then somehow it got transformed. Why
3	can't we find out what happened?
4	Who messed with the document and why? And
5	make sure, you know, there's some line of
6	communication between DCRA
7	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: We really are beating
8	this. I mean, I can give you one on one what
9	happened. They decided to rewrite the things in the
10	zoning regulations, and they are not allowed. When we
11	passed something, law, and they decided to rewrite
12	things to clarify things, to reformat things, and in
13	doing this left some things out, they jumped ahead and
14	included things they shouldn't have. It
15	MR. BARDIN: Madam Chair, look. I know
16	everybody feels frustrated or worse, but the fact is
17	we're out of school here. We're advisors to the
18	Director of DCRA. It's the Director who sent text to
19	the Office of Documents.
20	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Correct.
21	MR. BARDIN: It's the Director who has a
22	complaint, not this committee. The Director can talk

1	to the Mayor. The Director can talk to the Secretary
2	of D.C. The Director can talk to the Deputy Mayor who
3	is supposed to be supervising it, but it is, frankly,
4	not our business.
5	So could we
6	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Call the meeting?
7	MR. BARDIN: adjourn?
8	CHAIRPERSON KRESS: Do I hear a motion to
9	adjourn? Second? All in favor?
10	Thank you.
11	And could the subcommittee chairs stay so
12	that we can quick talk about what's going on tomorrow?
13	(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the meeting was
14	concluded.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	